

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application, and all claims stand rejected. Assignee traverses the rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,937, issued to Montville, et al. (Montville). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0039028, application of Eason (Eason). Claims 15-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montville. Assignee respectfully disagrees that the cited references disclose or render obvious the claimed subject matter of the instant application.

In rejecting claim 1, the office action cites Montville as disclosing providing a message composition interface for composing an outgoing message, wherein the interface comprises a message portion and a messaging settings portion and receiving from the messaging settings portion a messaging setting associated with the outgoing message being composed in the provided message composition interface, as required by claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended herein to further recite that more than one type of security scheme is available and displayed within the messaging settings portion. This amendment to claim 1 is supported in the specification of the instant application, for example at page 26, line 19 – page 28, line 1 and at Figure 6. As a non-limiting example, assignee's specification at page 27, lines 2-3 discusses different types of security schemes, such as S/MIME and PGP, that are available. Assignee respectfully submits that nothing in the Montville reference discloses this additional subject matter. For example, figure 13 of Montville only provides a checkbox to indicate that "Encrypt" has been selected. In other words, the user is presented with only a single option, not the multiple options recited in claim 1, in combination with its other limitations. Thus, the Montville

reference does not disclose that more than one type of security scheme is available and displayed within the messaging settings portion, as required by claim 1, and for at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable and should proceed to issuance.

The assignee disagrees with other positions in the office action as well. For example, the office action rejects dependent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Montville. As amended herein, claim 6 recites that the received messaging setting is an indication for encryption, which includes an indication of which of the more than one type of security scheme has been selected. Claim 6 has been further amended to recite that the indication for encryption includes an identification of a messaging account or service with which the messaging client is configured to operate. This amendment to claim 6 is supported in the specification of the instant application, for example at page 26, line 19 – page 28, line 1 and at Figure 6. Nothing in the Montville reference discloses the subject matter of claim 6 as amended. Montville does not disclose the existence of multiple security schemes, so it cannot disclose that an indication for encryption includes an indication of which of the more than one type of security scheme has been selected. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 6 is patentable over the cited reference and should proceed to issuance.

As another example, the office action rejects dependent claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Montville. As amended herein, claim 7 recites that the messaging account or service identifies a home messaging service or a desktop messaging service. This amendment to claim 7 is supported in the specification of the instant application, for example at page 26, line 19 – page 28, line 1 and at Figure 6. As a non-limiting example, the home messaging service may be a personal account at an e-mail service, while the desktop messaging service may be a work account at an e-mail service. Montville does not disclose a method

wherein a messaging setting received from the message composition interface includes an identification of a home messaging service or a desktop messaging service, as required by claim 7 in combination with its other limitations. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 7 is patentable over the cited reference and should proceed to issuance.

Independent claims 15 and 24 recite subject matter analogous to the subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 15 and 24 have been amended herein to further recite that more than one type of security scheme is available and displayed within the messaging settings portion. These claims were rejected in the office action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montville. The assignee respectfully submits that, because the subject matter of the additional limitation of claims 15 and 24 is not disclosed by Montville, the claims are allowable for at least this reason and should proceed to issuance.

Because independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable, their respective dependent claims are also allowable and should proceed to issuance. It is noted that the assignee has not, at this time, presented arguments with respect to a number of the dependent claims in the instant application. The assignee nevertheless reserves the right to argue the patentability of all of the dependent claims in the instant application at a future time, should that become necessary.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point; 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 586-3939